

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

**CHARLESTON DIVISION**

LORA ANN HOGAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:21-cv-00211

KILOLO KIJAKAZI,

*Acting Commissioner for the Social Security Administration,*

Defendant.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's Complaint seeking review of the decision of the Acting Commissioner of Social Security, Kilolo Kijakazi ("Commissioner") denying Plaintiff's application for a period of disability and disability insurance benefits ("DIB") under Title II of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 401–433. (ECF No. 1.) Also pending are the parties' cross motions for judgment on the pleadings. (ECF Nos. 7, 8.) By Standing Order entered January 4, 2016, and filed in this case on May 5, 2022, this action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Cheryl A. Eifert for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation ("PF&R"). (ECF No. 3.) Magistrate Judge Eifert filed her PF&R on November 2, 2022, recommending that this Court deny Plaintiff's request for judgment on the pleadings, grant the Commissioner's request for judgment on the pleadings, affirm the final decision of the Commissioner, and dismiss this matter from the Court's docket. (ECF No. 10.)

The Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner's right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984). In addition, this Court need not conduct a de novo review when a party "makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the Court to a specific error in the magistrate's proposed findings and recommendations." *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982).

Objections to the PF&R were due by November 21, 2022. (ECF No. 10.) To date, no objections have been filed.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the PF&R, (ECF No. 10), **DENIES** Plaintiff's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings, (ECF No. 7), **GRANTS** the Commissioner's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings, (ECF No. 8), **AFFIRMS** the final decision of the Commissioner, **DISMISSES** the Complaint, (ECF No. 1), and **DIRECTS** the Clerk to remove this case from the Court's active docket.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to send a copy of this Order to counsel of record and any unrepresented party.

ENTER: February 15, 2023



A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Th. Johnston', is positioned above a horizontal line.

THOMAS E. JOHNSTON, CHIEF JUDGE